



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,814	11/20/2001	Robin D. Wilson	VIGN1410	1585

44654 7590 05/18/2005

SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP  
1301 W. 25TH STREET  
SUITE 408  
AUSTIN, TX 78705

EXAMINER
----------

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,814

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 February 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 17-19 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9, 11-16, 20, 23-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 21 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2178

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 2/8/2005.

**This action is made Final.**

2. In the amendment, claims 1-29 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 20 are independent claims.

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings filed on 11/20/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. The rejections of claims 9-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, have been withdrawn, because appropriate corrections have been made.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

5. The rejections of claims 1-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, have been withdrawn, because appropriate corrections have been made.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 9, 11-16, 20, and 23-29 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Using Paradox 5 For Windows special edition, hereinafter Paradox, QUE, 1994, p17.326-331, and 525-537.

Regarding independent claim 9, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields--*assets*-- from unauthorized access by setting a master password for one user--*Parent*--, and an auxiliary password defining the type of access other users--*Child*--have to the table--sharing the selected asset with a second object (user) -- (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10--page 528, line 16).

Moreover, Paradox discloses setting passwords to protect the master user's database tables and its fields--*assets*-- from unauthorized access--*selecting one or more assets of the first object* (page 527, lines 10--page 528, line 16).

Furthermore, Paradox discloses setting passwords, which allows a user access to all the table functions, and another password, which only gives a user read-only access--*first mode in which both the first and second objects can utilize the asset, but only the first object can modify the asset* (page 527, lines 10--page 528, line 16, and fig. 19.1).

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 9, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as a master user having all access to the table and other users (including a third) having read-only access to the same table-- (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10--page 528, line 16).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 9, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields--*sharing a plurality of assets as a set--from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses--* (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding claim 13, which depends on claim 9, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as one user having access to a table, and all its functions (including read), and another having read-only access-sharing the table assets individually (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 9, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as one user having access to all table functions, and another having read-only access (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16). In other words one user can modify the table, and another cannot touch or more assets, which are not shared with the second object (second user).

Regarding claim 15, which depends on claim 9, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as one user having access to insert and delete some records and their fields in the table, but only able to view other fields, and another having insert and delete authority for the records which can only be viewed by the first user--*not shared with the first user*, and the authority to only view

Art Unit: 2178

the records which can be modified by the first user (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 9, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as one user having access to a table, and all its functions (including read) with a master password, and another having read-only access—*sharing the table assets only with direct descendants of the master user* (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding independent claim 20, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields—*assets*-- from unauthorized access by setting a master password for one user—*Parent*--, and an auxiliary password defining the type of access other users—*Child*-- have—*selecting two objects (users) which have a hierarchical relationship (Master and Auxiliary table access)* -- (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Moreover, Paradox discloses setting passwords to protect the master user's database tables and its fields—*assets* -- from unauthorized access—selecting one or more assets of the first object (page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Furthermore, Paradox discloses setting passwords, which allows a user access to all the table functions, and another password, which only gives a user read-only access—*first mode in which both the first and second objects can utilize the asset, but only the first object can modify the asset* (page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16, and fig. 19.1).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 20, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields--sharing a plurality of assets as a set-- from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses-- (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Paradox discloses protecting a database table--*the set comprises a class of assets*-- and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses-- (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 2, Paradox discloses protecting a database Table and its fields--*the class of assets is a child (of the table asset)*-- from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses-- (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 20, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as one user having access to a table, and all its functions (including read), and another having read-only access--*sharing the table assets individually* (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 20, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as one user having access to all table functions, and another having read-only access (page 525,

Art Unit: 2178

lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16). In other words one user can modify the table, and another cannot--*one or more assets, which are not shared with the second object (second user).*

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 20, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as one user having access to insert and delete some records and their fields in the table, but only able to view other fields, and another having insert and delete authority for the records which can only be viewed by the first user--*not shared with the first user, and the authority to only view the records which can be modified by the first user* (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 20, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as one user having access to a table, and all its functions (including read) with a master password, and another having read-only access--*sharing the table assets only with direct descendants of the master user* (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person



Art Unit: 2178

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 10-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paradox.

Regarding claim 10, which depends on claim 9, Paradox discloses protecting a database table and its fields--*sharing one or more the selected assets*-- from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as having multiple users with an auxiliary password with all access to the table (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose: a third object. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a third user or object having a master password, because Paradox teaches above allowing multiple users the benefit of full access to the table.

Regarding claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Paradox discloses protecting a database table--*the set comprises a class of assets*-- and its fields from unauthorized access by setting the various passwords accesses, such as having multiple users with an auxiliary password with all access to the table--*no less restrictive than the mode in which the asset is shared between the first and the second object* (page 525, lines 24-33, page 527, lines 10-page 528, line 16). Paradox fails to explicitly disclose: a third object. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included a third user or object having a master password, because Paradox teaches above allowing multiple users the benefit of full access to the table.

Art Unit: 2178

***Allowable Subject Matter***

10. Claims 10, and 21-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. Claims 1-8, and 17-19 are allowed.

***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments filed 10/5/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 9-14, and 20-29, the Applicant submits that Paradox does not disclose every single element found in the claims, such as the third mode (pages 7-8). The Examiner disagrees, because Paradox only needs to teach one limitation—first mode (in this instance)--out of the three proposed, because it **is only one from the group** that needs to be met by the rejection. Therefore, the claim language has been fully disclosed, as per the language.

Claims 10-11 remain rejected at least based on the dependency on claim 9, and the statement above.

***Conclusion***

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2178

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)

  
**CESAR PAULA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
5/13/05